

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/016,508	12/10/2001	Miguel N. Bermudez	042390P11384D	1145		
75	7590 01/23/2004			EXAMINER		
Todd M. Becker			HENDERSON, MARK T			
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP Seventh Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
12400 Wilshire			3722	4		
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026			DATE MAILED: 01/23/2004	1		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

* · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/016,508	BERMUDEZ, MIGUE	EL N.	Ou.		
7. 	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Mark T Henderson	3722				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ess			
THE REPLY FILED 29 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appelexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	ivoid abandonment of this application appl	cation. A proper rep ich places the applic	oly to a cation in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The danave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moteraned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the INITY AND ALL OF THE METERS AND ALL OF THE OF	of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S 136(a) and the appropriate extended to the final Office action; or (a)	ee MPEP extension fee u (2) as set fo	fee under orth in		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	s Brief must be filed within the pR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal	period set forth in of the appeal.				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:					
(a) \square they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);				
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	implifyin	g the		
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clain	ns.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendm canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NC	T place	the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	' to issues which we	re newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-5,7,8,19 and 21-26.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ app			_			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	1 1 h de	eLL			
10. Other:		A. L. WELLING SUPERVISORY PATENT TECHNOLOGY CENT				





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In regards to applicant's arguments that the Laurash, Kelly and Blankenship reference does not teach and article of manufacturing having an identifier that is electronicall stored in the component and "read therefrom for printing on the labels", the examiner submits again Blankenship does indeed disclose an identifie which can be read and placed as bar code on a label (Col. 3, lines 3-33) Although Blankenship does not disclose wherein the identifier i read therefrom for printing on the labels, the examiner submits that a recitation of the intended use (read for printing on labels) must result in a structurual difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Therefore, the identifier in the Laurash et al reference as modified by Kelly and Blankenship can be read for printing on labels.